

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are currently pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 10-12 are amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration in view of the above-outlined amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action identified that the drawings were previously objected to by the Draftsperson under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84 and that applicant failed to provide corrected drawings. To date, applicants have not received a copy of the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948). Applicants respectfully request that a copy of the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) be resent to applicants' undersigned attorney. Upon receipt, applicants will attend to the necessary revisions to the drawings.

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,509,974 to Hansen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,748,569 to Brooke et al. ("Brooke"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 is directed to a method for allowing a customer of a printing service provider to create a customer PDF document through a computerized interface and send the customer PDF document to the service provider through a data-communication network. The service provider then directs the customer PDF document to a suitable printing office through the network. The method includes generating the customer PDF document for printing on demand with a PDF engine using a data XML file and a design XML file. The customer PDF document generated using the data and design XML files is generated at the customer site. The data XML file includes data and its data type for printing which is created by the customer through the computerized interface. The design XML file includes data formatting information with a description of how the data is to be positioned and formatted in the customer PDF document created by the customer through the computerized interface. The data in the data XML file differs from the data formatting information in the

design XML file. The method further includes sending the customer PDF document to the service provider through the network for data-communication. The generation of the customer PDF document includes analyzing the data and design XML files, and merging data from the data XML file with the formatting information from the design XML file.

The Office Action alleges that Hansen discloses a method of embedding XML files to a PDF document. Hansen discloses a system and method for providing production printing instructions for a printed end document to a job preparation station. The printed end document is made up of a plurality of other documents received from the customer which are to be inserted in a predefined order and in a predefined format. The documents are either provided to the print shop on a disk in person or through an internet connection, as shown in Fig. 1a. The job submission station includes a computer and a receiver which receives the plurality of documents in electronic format. An input device, such as a keyboard or a mouse, is used to provide the job submission station operator with the ability to provide input instructions to the computer. The operator in the print shop uses the input device to arrange all of the documents into an electronic folder, such as a directory, and to arrange the documents in the order in which the documents are to be printed to compose the end document. The computer is programmed to automatically convert the document into a ready for printer format file and merged the plurality of documents together to create a single document. The computer also generates an electronic job ticket that provides global attributes for the printed end product. Hansen is directed to a method of how to produce a production plan for print jobs. Hansen does not disclose generating a customer PDF document at the customer site with a PDF engine. The PDF documents in Hansen are created at the print shop. Furthermore, Hansen does not disclose creating a customer PDF document using a design XML file and a data XML file. Hansen does not use multiple XML files. Additionally, these files are not created at the customer site.

The Office Action relies on Brooks to allegedly teach the deficiencies in Hansen. Brooks discloses a method and computer program product for generating XML documents using a script language that extends the capabilities of XML. The script language includes control statements for including data content and style information from a plurality of sources. One or more scripts may be developed that includes script language control statements. A script processor processes the scripts and generates a content document and a style document. The content document specifies the content to be included in the XML document, and the style document specifies the style for displaying the content in the XML document. One set of program instructions transform the content document and the style document into an XML document. Another set of program instructions convert the XML document to an output document for a selected type of display. The script language and script processor provide facilities for gathering content and style information from a plurality of sources. Numerous scripts may be generated to override and/or extend information in one or more of the other scripts, thereby allowing a developer to customize selected portions of the output document while using shared content and style for the remaining portions of the output document. The scripting language created by Brooks is embedded in a series of different XML files that need to be processed in at least three different steps. Brooks does not disclose creating a customer PDF document at a customer site. Furthermore, Brooks does not disclose creating a data XML and design XML file at the customer site. Brooks does not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed data XML file and the design XML file. Accordingly, Brooks fails to teach the deficiencies in Hansen. One of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine these references. The only similarities between Brooks and Hansen is the use of the terminology XML and PDF. Accordingly, the combination of these references would not render obvious the subject matter of claim 1.

Amended claim 7 is directed to a system for allowing a customer of a printing service provider to create a customer PDF document and send the customer PDF document to the service provider through a data-communication network. The service provider then directs the customer PDF document to a suitable printing office through the network. The system includes a computerized interface and a PDF engine. The PDF engine is configured to create the customer PDF document for printing on demand using a data XML file and a design XML file. The data XML file includes data and its data type for printing which is created by the customer through the computerized interface. The design XML file includes data formatting information with a description of how the data is to be positioned and formatted in the customer PDF document created by the customer through the computerized interface. The data in the data XML file differs from the data formatting information in the design XML file. The customer PDF document is generated at the site of the customer. The PDF engine is configured to analyze the data and design XML files and merge data from the data XML file with the formatting information from the design XML file.

Hansen and Brooks, discussed above, do not disclose, teach or suggest, either along or in combination, the subject matter of claim 7. The references fail to disclose the claimed PDF engine which creates a customer PDF document at the customer site using a data XML file and design XML file. Furthermore, the references fail to disclose the claimed design and data XML files. Accordingly, the combination of Hansen and Brooks does not render obvious the subject matter of claim 7.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and are allowable over the combination of Brooks and Hansen for at least the same reasons. Claims 8-12 depend from claim 7 and are allowable over the combination of Brooks and Hansen for at least the same reasons.

With regard to claims 2 and 9, Hansen contains no disclosure that the definitions are automatically embedded in the customer PDF document. In Hansen, any definitions are manually inserted by the print operator.


With regard to claims 4 and 10, Brooks does not use a design XML file. Instead, Brooks uses an XML document, which contains formatting instructions that need to be processed with an XML document to create some other output.

With regard to claims 5 and 11, neither Brooks nor Hansen disclose the creation of a questionnaire related to which content is to be printed in the final product.

Claims 6 and 12 are directed to the relationship between the data XML file and the design XML file. A value (or parameter) defined in a data XML file may be used by any design XML file that references this value. By separating these files, data may be edited without regard to the layout and vice versa. Brooke's scripting language has the ability to extract data from external files and define programmatic variables and arrays. Brooke couples data and layout in a more programmatic way, which requires a tight relationship between the two.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections based upon the combination of Hansen and Brooks.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims define subject matter that is patentable over the prior art cited of record. It is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Should further issues require resolution prior to allowance, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' undersigned attorney at the number below. Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,  
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP  
  
GLENN T. BARRETT  
Reg. No. 38705  
Tel. No. 703 905-2011  
Fax No. 703 905-2500

Date: November 8, 2004  
P.O. Box 10500  
McLean, VA 22102  
(703) 905-2000